

BDCP EIR/ EIS Review Document Comment Form
Chapter 18 Cultural Resources

| December 2011, FEDERAL COMMENTS | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|---------------------|---|---|---------|--|
| No. | Page # | Line # | Comment | Agency | ICF Response |
| | 18-1 and beyond | Entire chapter | SLM-There is a lot of information in this chapter that does not seem relevant to the impacts of the alternatives. You don't need to provide a history of the project area. Just describe the cultural resources that are found or may be found in the area. For example how does describing using day laborer contractors instead of sharecropping 1916 relevant to analyzing the impacts of the alternatives on cultural resources? It almost seems like section 18.1.12 is all the information you need to include in this section. | Federal | The discussion of the prehistoric, ethnographic, and historic past in the Plan Area provides an overview of the significant themes associated with cultural resources that may be affected by the action alternatives. The discussion of significance themes is a standard way of framing impact analysis, because those themes help determine what resources are eligible. In the absence of this context, there is no basis for determining significance, or integrity to convey significance, and thus eligibility. While this document does not evaluate individual resources, it is typical to frame the general themes that convey significance in an EIR/EIS. |
| | 18-25 to 18-34 | | This section could be summarized in a table form where it cites the various Federal, State, and Local laws and regulations and provides a brief discussion on each in the table. Keep expanded discussion of Section 106 and CEQA and everything else should simply be described in table form. Would be much more efficient. | Federal | The various state and federal laws listed are relevant to the set of state and federal agencies that may have some role in implementing the action, as well as the significance of impacts. Comment noted. |
| | 18-1 to 18-25 | | Try to summarize many parts of these sections. Use tables whenever possible. | Federal | The regulatory setting information is relevant to the identification of impacts and management of resources. Comment noted. |
| | 18-25 through 18-26 | 1-35, especially lines 8-10 on pg 18-36 | SLM-This information on NEPA requiring analysis of impacts on resources listed on the NRHP is misleading. NEPA does not specifically require that type of analysis. Please delete this section. Note: Elevate to Lead Agencies for guidance prior to making any changes. | Federal | The regulations implementing NEPA specifically mention NRHP-eligible and listed resources. One of the elements of significance of an impact under NEPA is "intensity." Intensity in turn is defined as the potential for an action to adversely affect NRHP-eligible and listed resources (40 CFR 1508.27[b]0[8]. See text revisions. |

BDCP EIR/ EIS Review Document Comment Form
Chapter 18 Cultural Resources

| | | | | | |
|--|--------|------|--|---------|--|
| | 18-35 | 2-25 | Consider tying in NR Bulletins and other Advisory and SHPO guidance to support your discussion of Impact Mechanisms and cite that guidance. Do this throughout the document to provide support to the overall cultural resources study. | Federal | NR Bulletins were previously included in the regulatory setting as a means of identifying the set of resource types regulated under Section 106. This was removed during the review process. We will consider including a summary of NR Bulletins in an appendix or other concise review. Comment noted. |
| | Global | | Need to address operational changes at upstream reservoirs that could affect reservoir levels and potentially uncover cultural resources. Reclamation has made this comment on all previous drafts, and it still needs to be incorporated. Under the No Action alternative state that “operational changes would not occur therefore there would be no affect on upstream reservoir levels.” | Federal | This issue has been addressed both in no action and the description of effect mechanisms. While modeling that considers both operational changes and the effects of climate change show the potential for increased drawn down of upstream reservoirs, the increase is small in both degree and frequency. This increase cannot meaningfully be linked to effects on discrete resources in a way that is amenable for identification of impacts. |
| | 18-36 | 20 | Meins Landing belongs in cumulative impacts, not no action. DWR is pursuing it, but there is not even a draft environmental document on it, and many unknowns and remaining issues on this project at this point. Please change “will” to “may”. | Federal | It is unclear, based on the response, if the commenter would like the discussion of Meins Landing deleted entirely from the no action discussion. The revision of will to may suggests that the commenter would like it to remain with the text as edited. Comment noted. |

BDCP EIR/ EIS Review Document Comment Form
Chapter 18 Cultural Resources

| April 2012, DWR COMMENTS | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------|--------|--|--|
| No. | Page # | Line # | Direction to ICF | Resolution |
| | | | Chapter 18 – Cultural and Historic Resources | |
| 1. | 18-60 | 25-39 | MMs CUL-1a, 1b, 1c, 1d, referred to for Alt1B do not appear in the discussion of MM CUL-1 for Alt1A on pg 45. Also, the Impacts 1,2,3,&4 for 1B don't match 1A, and all the impacts for 1B refer to the multiple MMs for CUL-1. Impact 6 is missing from Alt1B. In other resource chapters, all the impacts are repeated for each alternative, even if there is no impact. | The impacts for alternatives 1B through 9 will be revised to match 1A during the substantive revisions to be made once data from field surveys has been completed. |
| | | | | |